

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12483

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, July 21, 1963]

WHEN "JUSTICE" CHALLENGES "ORDER"

To hear Dr. Martin Luther King tell it, on his visit to Suffolk the other day, the preservation of order isn't of much consequence when it comes to a matter of justice.

This view came out when he criticized "the so-called moderates, who are more devoted to order than to justice."

In a sense, Dr. King performed a useful service in those few words. For he brought into unusually sharp focus a collision of values which forms the most explosive ingredient in the current swirl of racial troubles.

This relationship between order and justice, of course, is an old, old question. Since tribal times, order has been an essential element of any kind of social structure. And while tyrants have again and again used the instruments of order to perpetuate injustice, the maintenance of order has been just as essential to the preservation of hard-won individual rights and to everything that has lifted people out of ignorance and misery.

Even the freest of peoples, and certainly the American nation represents one of the farthest advances to date, have found it imperative, in the words of the preamble to our own Constitution, to "insure domestic tranquility."

For the founders, though they had joined in rebellion themselves against a government, faced the reality that the new government must protect itself against rebellion. The laws and the force necessary to that end were among their first creations.

Similarly, safeguards against civil disturbance and violations of the law must exist at all levels of authority if what we have here is to survive.

The theory that violence, or threats of violence, or situations inviting violence, may be used in behalf of justice, is one that can be condoned only in the extremes of governmental repression and in the absence of democratic channels for working remedies.

Because our system of agreed law is simply the best we have been able to work out so far, there are almost bound to be injustices in some degree. Some can be corrected faster or more completely than others. Further, there are human inequalities which governments can do only so much to correct anyway.

We would have only anarchy if all such victims of injustice considered themselves automatically freed of obligations to obey the law and possessed of the right to act violently against the rest of society.

When someone applies the label "justice" to something, as Dr. King does, this does not thereby render anything he does to that end either right or tolerable, not if we have anything in this country that is worth keeping.

For the "order" Dr. King sees as less than precious today may be indispensable tomorrow to preserve some of the very things he and his people are striving for.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has been an unusual innovation in our foreign relations. It is one measure that has met with general approval throughout the country.

I received in my mail—and I feel certain other Senators have received a copy of the same communication—a letter written by three young Americans who are teaching in the area of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. They state in their letter that all the information that has heretofore been released to the American people has been released by those who direct the Peace Corps. I believe that is

generally true. I do not know of any committee that has been sent into the field in an attempt actually to examine the work of the agency in various parts of the world; but I found the letter from Addis Ababa to be quite interesting. The three members of the Peace Corps who wrote to me have given their impressions of the Corps, in which they are serving at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS,
POST OFFICE BOX 1096, ADDIS ABABA,
Ethiopia, July 4, 1963.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: We are presently Peace Corps volunteers serving in Ethiopia as secondary schoolteachers. After completing 1 year of service, we have decided that there are some things which ought to be brought to the attention of the general public at home concerning Peace Corps activities.

We believe that members of the Peace Corps currently serving overseas should be given the opportunity to express some of their opinions. We further believe that a story about the opinions of Peace Corps volunteers by an independent reporter would be a service to the country.

The Peace Corps is supposedly one of the most successful new programs of the present administration. It is an infant Government agency which desires to expand its operations and increase its budget. Before Congress votes on new appropriations for the Peace Corps, we feel that the general public and Congressmen are entitled to more information about its activities. Are the objectives of the Peace Corps worthwhile? According to the Peace Corps Act of September 22, 1961, the purpose of the Peace Corps is:

"To promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries and areas men and women of the United States qualified for service abroad and willing to serve, under conditions of hardship if necessary, to help the peoples of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for trained manpower, and to help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people."

Few people will deny that these are worthy objectives. The next question that should be asked is, "Based on present information, are these objectives being achieved?" Also, "Could these objectives be achieved by some method superior to those at present employed by the Peace Corps?" We believe that these questions could rightly be the subject of some independent study. We also believe that the general public is entitled to this information, because it is the public that must pay for Peace Corps operations.

At present information concerning the Peace Corps comes almost exclusively from Government sources. This is because few groups independent of the Government have made studies of the Peace Corps, and also because few Peace Corps volunteers have completed their service overseas and returned to tell of their experiences. We believe that the information presently available through Government sources is inadequate. The Government may not be deliberately trying to manage Peace Corps publicity; however, we believe that since the Peace Corps staff is apparently already convinced of the Peace Corps' success, they tend to be biased in the information that they release to the general public. The presentation of such a one-sided view does not give the public an objec-

tive view of Peace Corps merits, and does not give them the opportunity to judge accurately whether they want to pay for an expanded Peace Corps. Biased Peace Corps publicity is not only detrimental to the general public but is also detrimental to prospective Peace Corps volunteers. Misrepresentation before and during training sometimes requires extensive readjustment by the volunteer after arriving in the field. There is some disillusionment and disappointment sometimes resulting in the resignation of volunteers from the Peace Corps.

A story about Peace Corps volunteers by an independent reporter would offer an opportunity for volunteers now in the field to express their individual hopes, opinions, and criticisms of the Peace Corps. These opinions, we believe would show a wide divergence of views on a great many subjects. If nothing else, they would dissipate the myth of the Peace Corps volunteer stereotype that current publicity seems to present to the public. We would like to offer, as a few examples, some of our opinions based on 1 year of experience.

Though we were told that we would suffer physical hardships, and though we expected them when we came, it is our opinion that very few volunteers in Ethiopia have experienced physical hardship. Publicity at home appears to emphasize the hardships that are endured by a minority and ignores the fact that most volunteers live in comparative comfort. Peace Corps publicity also states that volunteers live at a level comparable to a national who is serving in the same occupation as the Peace Corps volunteer. In reference to the Ethiopia project this publicity is completely false. Volunteers do not live on as high a level as State Department officials or Peace Corps administrators, but they also do not live on as low a level as Ethiopian nationals who teach secondary school.

It appears to us that there is confusion in Peace Corps administration. We received misinformation regarding Peace Corps policy while we were in training. Now it is seemingly impossible for us to ascertain our rights and obligations in the Peace Corps. Peace Corps administrators do not know the policies and do not provide us with written copies of Peace Corps policy. One begins to question the basis upon which administrators arrive at decisions. The Peace Corps administration also encourages the concept that all Peace Corps equipment is Government-owned and consequently may be used by any volunteer. We believe that this leads to the denial of responsibility by everyone and results in the misuse of Government equipment. All these things are not conducive to high morale in volunteers. It is our opinion that a study should be made to ascertain whether the purposes of the Peace Corps could not be better achieved through Government subsidization of private organizations rather than through direct Government action.

In conclusion, we believe that—because the success and proposed expansion of the Peace Corps is an important issue at this time; because most of the information about the Peace Corps is obtained exclusively from Government sources which are perhaps biased; because this bias tends to describe all Peace Corps volunteers as stereotyped, selfless, dedicated, idealistic people, ignoring the fact that there are widely divergent types of people in the Peace Corps; and because we feel that Peace Corps volunteers should be able to express their individual opinions of the work they are doing to the public at home—a magazine or newspaper story independently reporting the successes and failures of Peace Corps volunteers in the field would be a service to the country.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND T. DONALDSON.
THELMA BINGHAM.
PHILLIP W. BINGHAM.

12484

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 24

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, over the July 4 weekend the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee visited Michigan's Sleeping Bear Dunes and held a 3-hour public hearing on S. 792, the Hart-McNamara bill to establish a national lakeshore in that area.

The opposition turned out in large numbers and reiterated its blanket opposition to the proposal; and others in the area explained why they favored it.

On July 8 the Detroit News commented on the situation in a well-balanced editorial. In comment, I would point out that our Sleeping Bear Dunes bill goes to new lengths in lakeshore legislative history to assure continued private ownership of homes and expanded functions of a lakeshore advisory committee on which local citizens would be represented. It provides for permanent private ownership of the homes within the area, in perpetuity, and it establishes a permanent advisory committee with which the Secretary of the Interior is directed to consult—particularly with respect to park development and rights of property owners, both residential and commercial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Detroit News editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, July 8, 1963]

DUNES PARK FUROR

Opposition to Senator HART's proposal for a 77,000-acre park in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area of Michigan is as understandable as the enthusiasm of others to see it accomplished.

The opposition is grounded in the fear that control over the holdings and homes of local residents and owners will pass to a not too responsive Washington agency, the Department of the Interior. This feeling of a loss of independence and local decision-making power undoubtedly is a deeper issue than the size of the area to be embraced and the prospect of a tourist invasion.

Proponents of the park rightfully argue it is a last opportunity to preserve for posterity a peculiarly distinctive part of Michigan's dwindling national beauty and share it with all. Here is the familiar standoff that occurs always when what is good for the many for years to come is weighed against what pleases local residents in their lifetimes.

Certainly local opposition to the project was amply and convincingly demonstrated at the Frankfort hearing by a U.S. Senate committee on July 4. The setting of the hearing guaranteed that. Held in the area of potential park users, say in Detroit or Chicago, the results and sentiments expressed might have been directly opposite.

To resolve these differences should be the goal of park proponents. That can be accomplished, it would seem, only by giving local residents some guarantee their voices will be heard to a sufficient degree in the administration of the park if it is created.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a detailed survey of current anti-Semitic activities through the world has been published by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations.

It is a clear and comprehensive analysis of discrimination against a minority group struggling for religious freedom. It is not surprising that the Soviet Union is one of the greatest offenders.

Anti-Semitism inside the Soviet world is an old story. Moscow turns it on or off whenever it suits Soviet purposes. Inside Russia itself, Jews are, in effect second-class citizens. They are consistently discriminated against, and often are used as scapegoats. In the Soviet Union, where the state stands for atheism, Jews are considered a separate national group. No recognition is given to religion. Anti-Semitic discrimination seriously impairs their nationality rights—despite Soviet claims.

We in the United States properly view these developments with revulsion and anger. To express our strong feelings, our Government should bring this problem to the attention of the world, and should seek some means of its solution or alleviation. Certainly our Government should not hesitate to publicize and document the religious persecution which continues throughout the Soviet Communist empire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the article published by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations, which specifically deals with anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET UNION

In November 1962, the only synagogue in Lvov, the capital of the Western Ukraine, was closed. It had served a community of about 30,000. The closing was the culmination of an intensive yearlong campaign by the Communist party paper, Lvovskaya Pravda, which charged the synagogue with being "a shelter for idlers, speculators, parasites and moneygrubbers." In the spring of 1962, several members of the board had been arrested, convicted and imprisoned for "profiteering and hooliganism."

The identification of the synagogue with economic malpractices was purposeful, indeed symbolic. Jews have been the prime targets of a drive against "economic crimes"; of the 58 trials for such offenses held in 36 cities from the start of the campaign until March 1963, more than half have involved Jews.

ECONOMIC CRIMES

Beginning in May 1961, the Soviet Union enacted decrees extending the death penalty to economic offenses like pilfering public or state property, counterfeiting, currency speculation and bribery. Most observers interpreted this drastic move as an attempt to wipe out the nearly universal graft and corruption in Soviet industry and agriculture. Such practices are an inevitable response to the realities of the Soviet economy: shortages of raw and manufactured goods, unrealistic production goals, a complex bureaucracy and a low standard of living. As experts on the Soviet Union have pointed out, bribery to obtain needed supplies and graft to cut through redtape are often necessary if the economy is to function under these conditions. In a wider sense, the economic offenses express a desire to eke out, by whatever means, some measure of "private" security in a tightly controlled, Spartan economy.

The death penalty is being publicized to frighten those involved in economic malprac-

tices, and to scare off others who may be tempted by the financial rewards. During the 2-year period from May 1961 to April 1963, 141 persons were reportedly sentenced to death for economic offenses. Cases of this sort are covered more extensively in the Soviet press than others; the Government wants as many people as possible to learn that death by shooting is the ultimate penalty for economic crimes.

The barbaric severity of the punishment has shocked the outside world—witness a recent petition initiated by Henry Steele Commager, Lewis Gannett, William Ernest Hocking, Martin Luther King, Linus Pauling and Norman Thomas, and signed by 223 other prominent American scholars and clergymen. The document urged the Soviet Union to repeal the decrees on the ground that "the conscience of mankind rebels against excessive and inhumane punishment, of which capital punishment for economic crimes is a lamentable example."

JEWS AS SCAPEGOATS

No less disquieting is the fact that nearly 80 percent of those put to death for economic offenses have been Jews. The International Commission of Jurists has pointed out that the application of the death sentences shows "racial overtones," and that the number of Jewish-sounding names in the lists of the condemned is strikingly large. Observers of Soviet affairs believe that this is not accidental—that Jews, being a vulnerable minority, are made scapegoats for the bureaucrats in charge of the vast production and distribution machinery and forced to bear the brunt of public discontent with shortages or inferior quality of goods. In addition, Jews are singled out for object lessons showing how severely the state regards economic crimes.

The Soviet press emphasizes the Jewishness of the defendants in various ways. Repetition of obviously Jewish-sounding family names like Kaplan, Shapiro, Rabinovitch, Goldman, Zuckerman is most common. When the surname alone is not clearly Jewish, the first name and patronymic may be given in full instead of being abbreviated as is the normal practice; thus A. L. Kraisman appears as Abraham Lazarevitch Kraisman, and M. I. Maly as Mikhail Isaakovich Maly.

In mass trials involving dozens of people, Jewish names appear more frequently than others. For example, of 47 defendants in a trial in Frunze, the capital of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, more than half were Jews or related to Jews—though Jews constitute less than 1 percent of the population in the Kirghiz Republic. Nine named individuals "and others" were reported to have received death sentences; four of the nine bore Jewish names.¹ Analysts of the press reports believe the defendants' names were presented in a manner intended to stress the high proportion of Jews.

In another trial, at Dnepropetrovsk in the Ukraine, 24 defendants were accused of manipulating the price of apples. Though the majority were non-Jews, only the Jews were singled out for death sentences.²

Jewish defendants are depicted in the crudest anti-Semitic stereotypes as manipulators of glibly non-Jewish victims. Yet in reality most of the Jews executed for economic offenses occupied relatively minor posts, whereas non-Jews, who received light sentences, often held responsible positions. For example, at a trial in Leningrad, on charges of diverting goods from official trade channels, a Jew named Kraisman was sentenced to death, though he was only an agent employed by the several trade orga-

¹ Sovetskaya Kirghizia, Frunze, June 25, 27, 1962; July 22, 1962; Izvestia, Moscow, July 22, 1962.

² Pravda Ukrainy, Kiev, Apr. 4, 1962; Trud, Moscow, Mar. 21, 1962.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12485

nizations involved; the top officials, factory directors and managers received short prison terms.³

In some cases the press and the prosecution stressed the Jewishness of the defendants by referring to their religious observances. Apropos of Mordekhai Kakliashvili, who was shot for currency speculation in Tiflis, Georgia, the local paper wrote: "Even the religious books of the Torah have been used" to hide foreign currency. Later, the paper reported that the defendant had refused to sign a statement of his testimony on a Saturday because of his religious convictions, and that "speculation went on in full swing in the Lord's temple. While praying, they emptied each other's pockets."⁴

In Vilna, four Jews were sentenced to death for currency speculation, among them the first woman convicted in a case of this nature. Here the press and the prosecution involved the synagogue and the rabbi in the proceedings. The national trade-union daily, distributed throughout the Soviet Union, claimed that the defendants had gone to the local rabbi to settle their financial disputes, and concluded with an unmistakably anti-Semitic note: "These people stood apart from our life. They were not interested in how the Soviet people live."⁵ The case was also used for an attack on religion in general. According to one report, witnesses testified about the complicity of "representatives of the clergy of different religions," specifically local Catholic priests, as well as the local synagogue.⁶

In singling out Jews for economic offenses, publicly identifying them as Jewish through emphasis on their affiliation with the synagogue (the only Jewish institution remaining in the Soviet Union), punishing them more harshly than non-Jews in more responsible positions, and shooting a disproportionate number of them, the Soviet Government practices Stalinist policies even while condemning them.

Soviet leaders consistently deny that the Government's policy toward economic offenders is in any sense anti-Semitic. Thus, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev wrote to Bertrand Russell in February 1963:

"It is for the sake of justice that our people have to punish those who want to live at the expense of others, to rob our society. The attempts of reactionary propaganda to ascribe to our State pursuance and encouragement of the policy of anti-Semitism are not a new phenomenon."

Similar denials have accompanied the closing of synagogues, the arrest of congregation leaders, and the ousting of congregation officials. But there can be little doubt that such acts are intended as attacks on the remnants of Jewish community structure.

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE SYNAGOGUE

Though all religions are subject to restrictions and hostility in the Soviet Union, Judaism is singled out for special disabilities which add up to a program of planned attrition.

Jewish congregations, unlike others, are isolated; they may not form national or regional associations by which they might help one another and maintain spiritual unity. Religious leaders are not permitted to leave the country for visits with Jewish officials or institutions elsewhere, while members of other faiths have visited coreligionists, attended conferences, gone on pilgrimages, and even studied abroad.

For nearly 40 years, Jewish congregations have been forbidden to manufacture urgently needed religious articles such as prayer shawls and phylacteries, whereas other re-

ligious bodies have been authorized to acquire new vestments, ikons, and the like. And Jews have not been free to print religious calendars, except that during the last 2 years a few synagogues received permission, late in the Jewish calendar year, to produce small quantities for their own use.

While the Russian Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Moslems, and other creeds have been provided with facilities for training reasonable numbers of clergymen, there were no provisions for rabbinical training until recently, and there are hardly any now. In 1957, a rabbinic academy was opened in Moscow, but was never permitted to function properly. Its building needs were not met, and its enrollment, always limited to 20, has been whittled down to 3 or 4 through bureaucratic maneuvering.

Finally, a harsh discriminatory restriction is implicit in the Government's long-standing ban on the Hebrew language. Whereas most of the religions represented in the Soviet Union conduct their rituals in the congregants' languages, Judaism requires some knowledge of Hebrew for an understanding of services and prayer books; but none has been taught since 1917. During the same period, no Hebrew Bible and only one token edition (3,000 copies) of the Prayer Book have been printed. Therefore, most Jews who still attend synagogue cannot actively participate in the service. No comparable restrictions are imposed on the Moslems, who use Arabic as a special language for religious purposes; an Arab Koran was issued in 1958.

THE BAN ON MATZOH

In 1962, the Government discontinued its previous practice of providing flour, labor and facilities for baking matzoh, the unleavened bread used during the Passover season. Householders were advised to prepare a supply at home (a method few could follow, because of technical and ritual difficulties), but at the same time the press featured semiofficial attacks on private baking.

Since then, individuals who sell home-baked matzoh have been imprisoned for conducting private businesses, violating health regulations, "illegal commercial activities" or "price speculation."

The ban on matzoh production climaxed a policy of harassment dating back to 1957. Beginning in that year, the amounts produced by state bakeries were progressively curtailed. Synagogues were accused of making huge profits from the "illegal production" and sale of matzoh; in 1960, the officers of the Riga congregation were charged 115,000 rubles in taxes on their alleged private profits, and elsewhere synagogue officials were forced to resign their positions.

Like other restrictions on Jewish religious practices, the campaign against matzoh apparently is intended to separate Soviet Jews from their historical traditions. The press has virulently attacked the ancient feast of Passover, which commemorates the liberation of the Hebrews from slavery in Egypt and their emergence as a religious people. Such traditions, it is alleged, are chauvinistic; they "give rise to nationalist feelings, and poison the minds of Jews by diverting their thoughts to 'the land of their fathers' (while killing) love for the Soviet motherland."

JEWISH CULTURE CURTAILED

Unlike other minority groups in the Soviet Union, Jews are not free to carry on a cultural life in their own language. Official quarters insist that Russian Jews are culturally assimilated and not interested in Yiddish—despite the fact that in the 1959 census 20 percent of them did name it as their mother tongue.

In 1948, all of the country's Yiddish journals and publishing houses, cultural and

³ Sovetskaya Moldavia, Kishinev, July 23, 1959.

literary research institutes, theaters and dramatic schools were abruptly closed, as was the large Yiddish school system. Since then, such cultural activities have been permitted to resume only on a severely limited scale. The Minister of Culture, Ekaterina Furtseva, has indicated that any Government moves in this field are merely gestures addressed to the Soviet Union's friends abroad.

Until the late 1950's, Yiddish song recitals and literary readings by old artists remained virtually the only cultural expressions permitted. The response was great; though not of a high standard, the performances attracted a total audience of 3 million in 1957 alone. Today a handful of Yiddish theatrical and musical groups, all amateur, are active; they are in great demand in the major cities, but their schedules are sharply limited, and their achievements do not begin to compare with those of the Soviet Yiddish theater in the days of its professional glory.

Beginning in 1959, half a dozen Yiddish books, all by authors long dead, were reissued, but only in small editions (10,000 to 30,000), which were soon sold out. In 1961, after years of insistent pressure from abroad, the Government permitted publication of a Yiddish magazine, Sovetish Heimland.

Reference works and textbooks published in recent years treat Jews and their cultural achievement as virtually nonexistent. For example, a recent edition of the "Great Soviet Encyclopedia" devotes only 2 pages to Jews, as against 116 in an earlier edition.

DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC LIFE AND EDUCATION

Since World War II Jews have been eliminated from the Soviet Union's political leadership to a striking degree. As far as is known, there are none in the upper echelons of the Communist Party or the Government, with the sole exception of V. E. Dimchitz, first deputy chairman of the planning office. Before the war, 4.1 percent of the deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. were Jewish; by 1958, the figure had dropped to 0.25 percent. Jews are underrepresented in the supreme Soviets of most constituent republics, especially those three—Russia, Byelorussia and the Ukraine—where most of them live.

Careers of Jews, especially at the local level and that of the constituent republics, are markedly limited by discrimination. For the higher executive positions the rule seems to be "last hired, first fired." Jews have virtually disappeared from sensitive areas like the diplomatic service and the armed forces. Elsewhere, for example in cultural and scientific pursuits, especially able Jewish individuals may still be found in the middle ranks; but the Jewish share of employment in higher education, science and political life has not kept up with the nation's expanding opportunities.

VOICES OF PROTEST

As the Soviet Government's anti-Semitic policies have become increasingly plain, much indignation has stirred in the outside world. To name but one protest among many: in December 1962, a telegram to Premier Khrushchev, drafted by the American Jewish Committee and signed by American religious leaders of all faiths, scored discriminatory acts against Jewish religious and cultural institutions.

Inside the Soviet Union, too, certain intellectuals have been shocked to realize that anti-Semitism is once more being actively fostered. A protest, unusually explicit by Soviet standards, was voiced during 1961 by one of the country's most popular poets, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, in a poem entitled "Babi Yar."

Babi Yar is a ravine, just outside Kiev, where the Nazis murdered about 100,000 Ukrainian Jews in 1941. No monument marks this tragic place; the Government has

³ Sovetskaya Rossia, Moscow, Jan. 27, Mar. 1, Aug. 26, Nov. 16, 1961.

⁴ Zaria Vostoka, Tiflis, Nov. 26, 30, 1961.

⁵ Trud, Moscow, Jan. 16, 1962.

⁶ Sovetskaya Litva, Vilna, Feb. 3, 1962.

July 24

12486

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

remained coldly indifferent to all requests for one and, indeed, has generally remained silent about the holocaust of European Jewry under Hitler. In his poem, Yevtushenko, though not a Jew, identifies himself with suffering Jews from the days of Egyptian bondage to those of Hitler, and ringingly indicts those who would carry on the evil tradition of persecution in present-day Russia. He points up the existence of a historic Jewish people, which Soviet doctrine denies.

"Babi Yar" appeared in a journal published by the Soviet Writers Union and created a sensation.¹ A few days after its publication, the journal of the Writers Union of the Russian Federated Republic printed several attacks on Yevtushenko, in which his depiction of anti-Semitism in Russia was rejected.² In the ensuing conflict between "liberal" and party-line writers, anti-Semitism became an issue; the liberals deplored it, while the adherents of the party line denied it existed.

On December 18, 1962, the "Thirteenth Symphony" by Dmitri Shostakovich, Russia's best-known composer, had its premiere in Moscow. The symphony contains a choral section, set to word from "Babi Yar." The day before the first performance, Khrushchev and other top members of the Soviet Government met privately with several hundred prominent intellectuals and writers; at this meeting, complaints were made that the verses would be used by "enemies of the Soviet Union" to support charges of anti-Semitism. Yevtushenko subsequently changed the text for the second performance of the symphony, in February 1963, adding Russians and Ukrainians to the Jews who lie in Babi Yar and omitting a slogan ascribed to anti-Semites ("Trash and kikes and save Russia"). The music was not altered.

AN INEXTRICABLE VISE

The best and most recent survey of the condition of Russian Jews is "The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union" by Moshe Decter.³ The article concludes:

"In sum, Soviet policy places the Jews in an inextricable vise. They are allowed neither to assimilate, nor live a full Jewish life, nor to emigrate (as many would wish) to Israel or any other place where they might live freely as Jews. The policy stems, in turn, from doctrinal contradictions abetted by traditional anti-Jewish sentiments. On the one hand, the authorities want the Jews to assimilate; on the other hand, they irrationally fear the full penetration of Soviet life which assimilation implies. So the Jews are formally recognized as a nationality, as a religious group, as equal citizens—but are at the same time deprived of their national and religious rights as a group, and of full equality as individuals."

"Soviet policy as a whole, then amounts to spiritual strangulation—the deprivation of Soviet Jewry's natural right to know the Jewish past and to participate in the Jewish present. And without a past and a present, the future is precarious indeed."

FOREIGN STUDENTS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, student exchange programs between the United States and foreign countries can play a very worthwhile role in international relations. If foreign students have an opportunity to get a true picture of our country, then we hope they will always retain a better understanding of the workings of the U.S. Government and of

our goals as a nation. Since many of the students will be the leaders of their nations in years to come, it should be a vital part of U.S. efforts to promote student exchange programs. The program along these lines offered by Cornell University is an example of a highly successful effort to introduce foreign students to American life. I was very glad to be able to meet these students in Washington and to learn of the important work through this program by Cornell University. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks the text of this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN STUDENTS GIVEN CLOSEUP VIEW OF U.S. PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT

WASHINGTON.—For the more than 60,000 foreign students now in the United States, living abroad is both a pleasure and a challenge.

The pleasure is derived largely from their favorable impression of Americans, whom they have come to know as friendly, generous and sincere people. The challenge is the basic one of adjustment to a different way of life.

Some 150 countries are now represented at 1,800 U.S. colleges and universities. Their languages, traditions and mores cover a wide range, and sometimes the leap from a comparatively quiet world to the bustle of an American metropolis is not only confusing but painful for a student. Even at a small-town college he is confronted by strange and bewildering customs.

Fortunately, the young visitors do not face their problems alone. Those who are involved in the rapidly expanding student-exchange movement—and this includes not only universities but private organizations, foundations, and the U.S. Government—are eager to facilitate the foreign student's adjustment to American life.

Special orientation courses are given at the start of the school year, and most colleges have foreign student advisers whose task it is to give advice as needed on everything from religion to money, and who often act as a bridge between the students and the townspeople.

All this helps create an atmosphere of mutual understanding. As one young man from Malaya remarked after 9 months of contact with Americans, "I may not agree with everything you do, but at least I think I understand why you do it."

In the course of their stay in the United States, the students have an opportunity to participate in American life not only at school but also in their communities. For 9 years the 294 people of Burne, Kans., have invited groups of foreign students from the University of Kansas to share their Thanksgiving Day and experience life in a typical small town in the Midwest. Other communities periodically invite foreign students to spend weekends with local families who are always delighted to meet people from other lands.

One of the major schools playing host to foreign students is Cornell University, located in upper New York State. Its 17 colleges, which offer specialized education in everything from agriculture to hotel management in addition to the traditional liberal arts course, attract young people from every part of the world. At present its foreign student population numbers more than 860 persons representing 85 foreign countries.

Cornell, like other institutions of its kind, makes a special effort to give these young people as broad and true a picture of life

in the United States as possible. A recent weekend spent by a group of foreign students was typical of the programs arranged for them.

Among the 40 were young people from the Middle East, Europe, Canada, the Far East, Africa, and Latin America—22 countries in all. Included in the group were couples from Japan, Ireland, Australia, Chile, and Turkey, as well as four nuns from Canada.

The students came down by bus from Cornell to Washington in the manner of ordinary tourists, but during their long weekend in the capital they saw and heard much more than the casual visitor. Thanks to the cooperation of many individuals and Government departments, they obtained new insight into the political system under which Americans live.

Even before their arrival the visitors from abroad were made to feel welcome, for many more homes had been offered than there were students. As a result, some families which were unable to give the students overnight hospitality entertained them at dinner. In each case, the hosts were Cornell alumni, working in cooperation with the International Student Office at Cornell.

The students, many of whom are expected to assume positions of responsibility on their return home, were given an opportunity to talk with some of the men who are engaged in decisionmaking in the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

At a luncheon in the old Senate Office Building, Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York told the students that, while intolerance exists among some groups in the United States, "they represent only a minority, and a minority that is steadily getting smaller." Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, describing himself as the son of an immigrant from "Russian-occupied Poland," said that everyone in America is a member of a minority. "We have majority rule in this country, in a democratic ideal," he said, "but because we also belong to minorities, we are careful to protect the rights and interests of minorities."

During the weekend the group visited the Department of State, where Daniel W. Montenegro, Director of the Office of Public Services, described the structure of the Department and how American foreign policy is carried out. Later he freely answered questions made by the students.

At the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Arnold W. Frutkin, Director of International Programs, discussed its operations, explaining that this program involves cooperation with other countries, and that it is an agency for exchange of information with others. He pointed out that, in a number of instances, the United States has worked hand in hand with other countries in making space probes.

Subsequently the students were conducted on a special tour of the White House, visited the National Gallery of Art, the Supreme Court Building, the Lincoln Memorial, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Jefferson Memorial.

It was a busy weekend for the students and obviously a rewarding one, for they later summed up the program as "typical American friendliness."

AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD FEDERAL FUNDS BECAUSE OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, some weeks ago, together with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I directed to the several executive agencies inquiries in order to determine whether they felt they were administering any Federal-funds program which in any re-

¹ Literaturnaya Gazeta, Sept. 16, 1961.

² Literatura i Zhizn, Sept. 21, 1961.

³ Foreign Affairs, January 1963.